



APPENDIX A – CEQA CHECKLIST

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

DRAFT

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FOR THE
DIGITAL 395 MIDDLE MILE PROJECT**

Lead Agency:

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 Van Ness Avenue

San Francisco, CA 94102

Contact: Andrew Barnsdale, (415) 703-3221

Prepared for:

CALIFORNIA BROADBAND COOPERATIVE, INC.

1101 Nimitz Avenue

Vallejo, California 94592

Contact: Michael Ort

Prepared by:

CHAMBERS GROUP, INC.

5 Hutton Centre Drive, Suite 750

Santa Ana, CA 92707

(949) 261-5414

August 2011

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| SECTION 1.0 – ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR THE DIGITAL 395 PROJECT | 1 |
| 1.1. ORGANIZATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS | 2 |
| 1.2. TERMINOLOGY USED IN THIS ANALYSIS | 2 |
| 1.3. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS | 2 |
| 1. AESTHETICS | 3 |
| 2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES | 4 |
| 3. AIR QUALITY | 5 |
| 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES | 6 |
| 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES | 7 |
| 6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS | 8 |
| 7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS | 10 |
| 8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS | 10 |
| 9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY | 15 |
| 10. LAND USE AND PLANNING | 17 |
| 11. MINERAL RESOURCES | 18 |
| 12. NOISE | 18 |
| 13. POPULATION AND HOUSING | 20 |
| 14. PUBLIC SERVICES | 21 |
| 15. RECREATION | 22 |
| 16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC | 23 |
| 17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS | 24 |
| 18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE | 26 |
| SECTION 2.0 – REFERENCES AND DATA SOURCE LIST | 27 |
| SECTION 3.0 – REPORT AUTHORS AND CONSULTANTS | 29 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Table 1: Schools in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Route | 11 |
| Table 2: Airports in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Route | 13 |

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SECTION 1.0 – ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR THE DIGITAL 395 PROJECT

1.1. ORGANIZATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Sections 1 through 18 provide a discussion of the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Project. The evaluation of environmental impacts follows the questions provided in the Checklist provided in the CEQA Guidelines.

1.2. TERMINOLOGY USED IN THIS ANALYSIS

For each question listed in the Impact Statement checklist, a determination of the level of significance of the impact is provided. Impacts are categorized in the following categories:

- **No Impact.** A designation of no impact is given when no adverse changes in the environment are expected.
- **Less than Significant.** A less than significant impact would cause no substantial adverse change in the environment.
- **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** A potentially significant (but mitigable) impact would have a substantial adverse impact on the environment but could be reduced to a less than significant level with incorporation of mitigation measure(s).
- **Potentially Significant.** A significant and unavoidable impact would cause a substantial adverse effect on the environment, and no feasible mitigation measures would be available to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

1.3. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to the project (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant.

“Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if substantial evidence exists that an effect may be significant. If one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries exist when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

“Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” Mitigation measures are identified and explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures may be cross-referenced).

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the Program EIR or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (Section 15063[c] [3][D]). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

- a) Earlier analyses used where they are available for review
- b) Which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis
- c) The mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project for effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated”

References and citations have been incorporated into the checklist references to identify information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document, where appropriate, includes a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

Source listings and other sources used or individuals contacted are cited in the discussion.

The explanation of each issue identifies:

- a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question
- b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

1. AESTHETICS

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| a) Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.8 and 4.8 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| b) Would the Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.8 and 4.8 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| c) Would the Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation. If construction staging areas are visible from residences, public gathering areas, recreational areas, facilities, and/or trails, then construction staging areas shall be visually screened using temporary screening fencing of appropriate design and color (MM-AVR-1). Implementation of this Mitigation Measure will result in less than significant impacts to existing visual character or quality.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| d) Would the Project create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.8 and 4.8 of the Draft EA/IS.

2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| a) Would the Project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. Refer to sections 3.9.2 and 4.9.2 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| b) Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. Refer to sections 3.9.2 and 4.9.2 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| c) Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. Refer to sections 3.9 and 4.9 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| d) Would the Project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. Refer to sections 3.9 and 4.9 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| e) Would the Project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. Refer to sections 3.9 and 4.9 of the Draft EA/IS.

3. AIR QUALITY

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| a) Would the Project result in conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.2 and 4.2 of the Draft EA/IS. Since the Preferred Alternative will produce primarily temporary construction activity and will not directly disturb the Owens Valley Planning Area and construction activity was not identified as a source that required mitigation in any of the AQMPs, it is expected that the Preferred Alternative will have a less than significant impact on applicable air quality plans.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| b) Would the Project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.2 and 4.2 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| c) Would the Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.2 and 4.2 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| d) Would the Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.2 and 4.2 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| e) Would the Project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.2 and 4.2 of the Draft EA/IS.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| a) Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Refer to sections 3.6 and 4.6 of the Draft EA/IS. With implementation of the Mitigation Measures MM-Bio-1 through MM-Bio-27, described in detail in Appendix B, the Proposed Project will not result in significant adverse effects to special status plant or animal species.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| b) Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.6 and 4.6 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>c) Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Less than Significant Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>No Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
|---|---|---|--|--|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.6 and 4.6 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>d) Would the Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Less than Significant Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>No Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
|---|---|--|--|--|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.6 and 4.6 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>e) Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Less than Significant Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>No Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
|--|---|--|--|--|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.6 and 4.6 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>f) Would the Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Less than Significant Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>No Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
|--|---|--|--|--|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.6 and 4.6 of the Draft EA/IS.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p>a) Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Less than Significant Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>No Impact</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> |
|--|---|---|---|--|

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Refer to sections 3.7 and 4.7 of the Draft EA/IS. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-CR-1 and MM-CR-2, discussed in Appendix B, potential impacts to Cultural Resources will be less than significant.

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| b) Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-CR-1 and MM-CR-2, discussed in Appendix B, potential impacts to Cultural Resources will be less than significant. Refer to sections 3.7 and 4.7 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| c) Would the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-CR-1 and MM-CR-2, discussed in Appendix B, potential impacts to Cultural Resources will be less than significant. Refer to sections 3.7 and 4.7 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| d) Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. With the implementation of MM-CR-3, potential impacts to human remains will be less than significant. Refer to sections 3.7 and 4.7 of the Draft EA/IS.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| a) Would the Project result in exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.4 and 4.4 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.4 and 4.4 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.4 and 4.4 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| iv) Landslides? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.4 and 4.4 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| b) Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.4 and 4.4 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| c) Would the Project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.4 and 4.4 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| d) Would the Project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.4 and 4.4 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| e) Would the Project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. The Proposed Project would not result in new or increased demand for the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impact would occur.

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| a) Would the Project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.3 and 4.3 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| b) Would the Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.3 and 4.3 of the Draft EA/IS.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| a) Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.12 and 4.12 of the Draft EA/IS. Proper handling, storage, and disposal of all hazardous materials in accordance with applicable regulations would reduce impacts to a less than significant level

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| b) Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.12 and 4.12 of the Draft EA/IS. With the implementation of the Applicant Proposed Measure APM-HHS-1, potential impacts to Human Health and Safety will be less than significant

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| c) Would the Project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project route is located within the vicinity of existing schools along the Project route as seen in Table 1 (Google Earth, 2010). The Proposed Project would involve the short-term use of heavy equipment during construction that would emit emissions associated with internal combustion engines, (i.e., diesel and gasoline); however, such emissions are considered to have low toxicity. Furthermore, proper handling, storage, and disposal of all hazardous materials in accordance with applicable regulations would reduce impacts to area schools to a less-than-significant level. The emissions would be associated with construction activities and would cease upon completion of construction. The Proposed Project would not involve the use of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials once operational.

Table 1: Schools in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Route

| County | School Name | Approximate Distance from Route |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| San Bernardino | Central High School | 0.18 mi |
| | Waterman School | 0.22 mi |
| | Buena Vista Community School | 0.23 mi |
| | Henderson Elementary School | 0.21 mi |
| | Head Start | 0.14 mi |
| | Ingels School | 0.18 mi |
| Kern | Boron High School | 0.15 mi |
| | Wind in the Willows Preschool | < 0.10 mi |
| | West Boron Elementary School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Randsburg Elementary School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Cerro Coso Community College | < 0.10 mi |
| | Embry Riddle Aeronautical University | < 0.10 mi |
| | James Monroe Middle School | < 0.10 mi |
| | St. Anne's Catholic School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Ridgecrest Charter School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Liberty Christian School | 0.17 mi |
| | Faller Elementary School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Pilgrim Christian | < 0.10 mi |
| | Opportunities for Learning | < 0.10 mi |
| | Ridgecrest Learning Center | < 0.10 mi |
| | Gateway Elementary School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Inyokern Elementary School | 0.11 mi |
| | Bridge Learning Center | 0.15 mi |
| | Immanuel Christian School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Vieweg Elementary School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Las Flores Elementary School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Burroughs High School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Mesquite High School | 0.11 mi |
| Inyo County | Olancho Elementary School | <0.10 mi |
| | Lo-Inyo Elementary School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Mt. Whitney Preschool | < 0.10 mi |
| | Warren E. Hanson Preschool | 0.11 mi |
| | Imaca Headstart Lonepine | < 0.10 mi |
| | Opportunity School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Lone Pine High School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Big Pine High School | < 0.10 mi |

Table 1: Schools in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Route

| County | School Name | Approximate Distance from Route |
|-------------|---|---------------------------------|
| | Big Pine Elementary School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Eureka Dunes High School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Bristlecone Community Day School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Bishop High School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Country School House | < 0.10 mi |
| | Home Street Middle School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Pine Street School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Calvary Christian School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Jill Kinmont Booth School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Inyo County Community School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Cero Coso Community College | < 0.10 mi |
| | Bishop Independent Study School | < 0.10 mi |
| | White Mountain Research Station | < 0.10 mi |
| Mono | Edna Beaman Elementary School | < 0.10 mi |
| | High Desert Academy | < 0.10 mi |
| | Mammoth Elementary School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Cerro Coso Community College | < 0.10 mi |
| | Mammoth High School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Sierra High School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Mammoth Middle School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Lee Vining Elementary School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Healthy Start Elementary School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Imaca Lee Vining State Preschool | < 0.10 mi |
| | Lee Vining High School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Lee Vining Community Day School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Eastern Sierra Academy | 0.12 mi |
| | Bridgeport Elementary School | 0.16 mi |
| | USMC Mountain Warfare School | < 0.10 mi |
| | AMACA Headstart-Coleville | < 0.10 mi |
| | Antelope Elementary School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Coleville High School | < 0.10 mi |
| Douglas | Crossroads Learning Center | < 0.10 mi |
| | Western Nevada Community College | < 0.10 mi |
| | Minden Elementary School | 0.14 mi |
| | Grace Christian Academy | < 0.10 mi |
| Carson City | Capital Christian School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Carson Montessori School | 0.20 mi |
| Washoe | New Beginnings Child Development Center | 0.17 mi |
| | Pleasant Valley Elementary | 0.20 mi |
| | Brown Elementary School | < 0.10 mi |

Table 1: Schools in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Route

| County | School Name | Approximate Distance from Route |
|--------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Bishop Monague High School | 0.23 mi |
| | Sierra Vista Children's Academy | 0.16 mi |
| | Lakeside Kindercare | 0.21 mi |
| | Sunflower Preschool | 0.14 mi |
| | My First School | < 0.10 mi |
| | Our Lady of the Snows School | 0.15 mi |
| | Mount Rose Elementary School | 0.21 mi |
| | Munchkinland Preschool | 0.20 mi |
| | Little Learners II | < 0.10 mi |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| d) Would the Project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.12 and 4.12 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project route is located within the vicinity of both public and private airports along the Project route as seen in Table 2 (Google Earth, 2010); however, workers will be in the vicinity of the airports temporarily, only during Project construction; and the Project would not result in a safety hazard for people working in the Project area. Therefore, impacts related to public airports would be less than significant.

Table 2: Airports in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Route

| County | Airport Name | Approximate Distance from Route |
|--------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Kern | Boron Airstrip (private) | 0.18 mi |
| | Borax Airport (private) | 2.0 mi |
| Inyo | Inyokern Airport (public) | < 0.1 mi |
| | China Lake Naval Airfield (military) | 1.6 mi |
| | Independence Airport (public) | 0.14 mi |
| | Lone Pine Airport (public) | 0.5 mi |

Table 2: Airports in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Route

| County | Airport Name | Approximate Distance from Route |
|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Mono | Eastern Sierra Regional Airport, Bishop (public) | < 0.1 mi |
| | Mammoth Yosemite Airport (public) | < 0.1 mi |
| | Lee Vining Airport (public) | 0.38 mi |
| Douglas Carson City Washoe | Bryant Field Airport, Bridgeport (public) | < 0.1 mi |
| | Minden-Tahoe Airport (public) | < 0.1 mi |
| | Carson City Airport (public) | 0.17 mi |
| | Reno/Tahoe International (public) | 1.9 mi |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project route is located within the vicinity of both public and private airports along the Project route as seen in Table 2 (Google Earth, 2010); however, workers will be in the vicinity of the airports temporarily, only during Project construction; and the Project would not result in a safety hazard for people working in the Project area. Therefore, impacts related to private airports or airstrips would be less than significant.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| g) Would the Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed action involves the installation of optical fiber underground within the Caltrans right-of-way (ROW), County maintained dirt roads, or Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) ROW; and buildings would be constructed within existing land use areas that are zoned for utilities. During the construction of the Preferred Alternative, ROWs and possibly lanes of roadways would be temporarily closed. While any closures of roadways during construction activities would be temporary, such closures could increase traffic levels and constrain circulation in the area, resulting in potentially significant impacts. With the implementation of minimization measures defined in Appendix B of the Draft EA/IS (Infrastructure Measures), including APM I-1 (Roadway Capacity Maintenance) and APM I-2 (Prepare Transportation Management Plans) effects on emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would be less than significant.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| h) Would the Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project route is located in some areas that are prone to occurrences of wildland fires; however, no residences are being built as part of the Proposed Project, and construction crews would be in the area only temporarily. All construction and operation activities would be conducted in compliance with standard safety protocols, which would minimize the potential release of flammable materials (including fuel, lubricants, paint, and solvents). No significant impacts are expected.

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| a) Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.5 and 4.5 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| b) Would the Project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.5 and 4.5 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| c) Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.5 and 4.5 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| d) Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or offsite? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.5 and 4.5 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| e) Would the Project create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.5 and 4.5 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| f) Would the Project otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The Proposed Project is not expected to degrade water quality; MM-W-1 and MM-W-2 would be implemented in the event of a leak or spill of fluids, resulting in less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. Refer to sections 3.5 and 4.5 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| g) Would the Project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. Refer to sections 3.5 and 4.5 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| h) Would the Project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. Refer to sections 3.5 and 4.5 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| i) Would the Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.5 and 4.5 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| j) Would the Project result in inundation by seiche, ¹ tsunami, ² or mudflow? ³ | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is located in an inland area and would not be at risk for a tsunami. Risks from seismic hazards, such as seiches, are considered low, as only a small portion of the Project route is adjacent to a large body of water (Mono Lake). Due to the terrain of the Proposed Project site, mudflows could occur at certain mountainous areas along the Proposed Project route. In the event of a mudflow, the portions of the Proposed Project site could be inundated with mud, which may cause a delay in work; however, due to the infrequent potential for mudflows to occur, and the short-term nature of the Project, a less than significant impact would occur.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| a) Would the Project physically divide an established community? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. The Proposed Project would not physically divide an established community. The purpose of the Proposed Project is to provide broadband capability to currently underserved communities. The Proposed Project involves the installation of fiber-optic cable and associated infrastructure. The pre-fabricated buildings (nodes) will be placed within the communities to provide broadband service to these communities. Neither the construction nor the placement of infrastructure will divide an established community. No impacts will occur.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| b) Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. Refer to sections 3.9 and 4.9 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| c) Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|

¹ Seiche: Surface wave created when a body of water is shaken

² Tsunami: Large ocean waves generated by major seismic events

³ Mudflow: Hillside slippage

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Refer to sections 3.9 and 4.9 of the Draft EA/IS. Section 4.9.1 includes the following significance criterion: Directly or indirectly disrupt an established or recently approved land use. This is not a criterion required under Appendix G of CEQA; however, analysis of this impact is provided since there is the potential for the Proposed Project to disrupt surrounding land uses. As such, Mitigation Measure LU-1 would be required, which involves notification regarding construction activities and a procedure for responding to construction complaints or questions, will reduce these temporary construction impacts to less than significant.

11. MINERAL RESOURCES

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| a) Would the Project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. The Proposed Project would conform to all governing agency standards and not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. No impact would occur.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| b) Would the Project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. The Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. No impact would occur.

12. NOISE

Existing Conditions

Refer to section 3.1 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| a) Would the Project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to section 4.1 of the Draft EA/IS. The Proposed Project will be in conformance with all codes and ordinances with the exception of pneumatic tools that may be utilized during installation of proposed buildings. The operation of pneumatic tools, however, is expected to occur only during building installation within existing industrial areas. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| b) Would the Project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Impacts of excessive groundborne vibration or noise will be less than significant with the implementation of MM-N-1; if Project construction activities with ground borne vibration activities occur within 100 feet of sensitive receptors, the occupants and property owners shall be notified of the construction activities 15 days prior to construction. Refer to section 4.1 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| c) Would the Project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to section 4.1 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| d) Would the Project cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to section 4.1 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project route is located within the vicinity of both public and private airports along the Project route as seen in Table 2 (Google Earth, 2010); however, people residing or working in the vicinity of the airports would be exposed to project-related noise only during Project construction in the specific area temporarily. The Proposed Project would not result in excessive noise levels to those residing or working within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project route is located within the vicinity of both public and private airports along the Project route as seen in Table 2 (Google Earth, 2010); however, people residing or working in the vicinity of the airports would be exposed to project-related noise only during Project construction in the specific area temporarily. The Proposed Project would not result in excessive noise levels to those residing or working within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| a) Would the Project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project will involve the extension of broadband infrastructure into communities that are currently underserved. Unlike the provision of water or roads, broadband capacity would not be a defining growth factor for Eastern Sierra communities. The Preferred Alternative will not involve the extension of any other utility services or roads to underdeveloped areas, and no new infrastructure facilities are required for the Proposed Project. No direct growth-inducement would result from the extension of growth-defining utilities or service systems or roads.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| b) Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. The Proposed Project would not displace any existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The Proposed Project would not displace any people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| c) Would the Project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. See response to 13.b).

14. PUBLIC SERVICES

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <p>a) Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p> <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</p> <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Less than Significant Impact</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <p>No Impact</p> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>Fire Protection?</p> | | | | |

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.12 and 4.12 of the Draft EA/IS. Since construction activities will be temporary in nature, and public services will not be needed after project completion, there will be less than significant impacts to fire and police protection facilities.

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| <p>b) Police Protection?</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p> <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</p> <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Less than Significant Impact</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <p>No Impact</p> <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|---|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.12 and 4.12 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--------------------|--|---|---|---|
| <p>c) Schools?</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p> <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</p> <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Less than Significant Impact</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <p>No Impact</p> <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------|--|---|---|---|

Less than Significant Impact. Table 1 in section 8 (c) presents all school facilities within 0.25 mile of the Project route. While construction activities could occur in the vicinity of existing schools along the Project route, the Proposed Project would not cause a need for new or physically altered facilities. Most of the workers for the Proposed Project are expected to commute to the Project site daily or already reside in the local area. The impact of these workers on the area's school facilities would be negligible or already factored due to their current place of residence; therefore, the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on schools.

| | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| d) Parks? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 4.9.1 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| e) Other public facilities? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. The Proposed Project would not result in any impacts to other public facilities.

15. RECREATION

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| a) Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Most of the workers for the Proposed Project are expected to commute to the Project site daily or already reside in the local area. The impact of these workers on the area's recreational facilities would be negligible or already factored into due to their current place of residence. Of the remaining workers, these would generally establish transient residence in the area during the work week and return to their permanent place of residency during their days off. While these workers may make some use of the recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Proposed Project route or visit nearby recreation areas, a temporary increase of workers to a much larger population pool in the area, averaged over all the recreational facilities available in the project area, would have little, if any, measureable impact on the existing facilities or result in the need for expansion or new facility construction. Neither construction nor operation of the Proposed Project is expected to result in an increase in the local populations. A less than significant impact would occur.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| b) Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project involves the installation of fiber-optic cable and associated infrastructure; it does not include any recreational facilities. Neither construction nor operation of the Proposed Project is expected to result in an increase in the local populations. Therefore, the Proposed Project will not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. A less than significant impact would occur.

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| a) Would the Project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.10 and 4.10 of the Draft EA/IS. APM I-1 (Roadway Capacity Maintenance) and APM I-2 (Prepare Transportation Management Plans), in addition to APM LU-1, will be implemented to ensure that potentially significant impacts associated with short-term lane closures during construction are reduced to less-than-significant levels

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| b) Would the Project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.10 and 4.10 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| c) Would the Project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. The Proposed Project route is located within the vicinity of both public and private airports along the Project route as seen in Table 2 (Google Earth, 2010); however, impacts from construction will be temporary in nature and will not affect air traffic patterns. Both the height of construction activity and the height of any structures to be installed as part of the Proposed Project would be similar to the height of existing infrastructure and buildings. The Preferred Alternative will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| d) Would the Project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. Refer to sections 3.10 and 4.10 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| e) Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.10 and 4.10 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| f) Would the Project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project could have the potential to impact alternative transportation programs during construction; however, most of the Proposed Project route is located on major highways or county maintenance roads. Any impacts to public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities will occur within established communities; however, construction activity is temporary in nature, and Applicant Proposed Measures I-1 and I-2 are in place to minimize any potential effects on roadways. No conflicts with alternative transportation would occur once the Project is operational. Impacts would be less than significant.

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| a) Would the Project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Portable toilets brought to staging areas for construction crews would be emptied into septic tanks or municipal sewage systems. No part of construction or operation of the Proposed Project would generate wastewater in amounts exceeding the capacity of local facilities. The buildings associated with the Proposed Project would be un-manned and would not require a hookup to any sewage or septic systems. Therefore, the Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements or require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. A less than significant impact would occur.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| b) Would the Project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

No Impact. See response to 17.a).

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| c) Would the Project require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Less than Significant Impact. Compaction of soils as a result of project construction might cause site specific increases in runoff rates during rain events. Because of the localized nature of the soil compaction, any changes in runoff rates would be minor. The Proposed Project includes the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which includes BMPs to control stormwater runoff and runoff quality. The Proposed Project would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. No stormwater drainage facilities are required for the operation of the fiber-optic cable.

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| d) Would the Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project requires minimal water use for dust control during the construction period. The amount of water used per day for dust suppression would depend on location, weather conditions, road surface conditions, and other site-specific conditions. Water use during Proposed Project construction will be coordinated such that there would be no change in the ability of the water suppliers to serve Proposed Project area demands. Water sources are anticipated include local available resources, such as municipal water facilities and local private land owners and entities. No water is required for the operation of the fiber-optic cable. A less than significant impact would occur.

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| e) Would the Project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|--|--|---|

No Impact. See response to 17.a).

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| f) Would the Project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.10 and 4.10 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| g) Would the Project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would comply with all relevant federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. In addition, APM I-3 (Prepare Recycling Program) would be implemented as part of the Proposed Project. APM I-3 (Prepare Recycling Program) will be implemented to ensure that potentially significant impacts associated with short-term waste disposal during construction are reduced to less-than-significant levels. Compliance would include designated storage areas, trash containers, and recycling bins within the staging areas.

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| a) Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to sections 3.6, 4.6, 3.8 and 4.8 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| b) Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to section 4.13 of the Draft EA/IS.

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| c) Does the Project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No Impact <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Less than Significant Impact. Refer to section 4.12 of the Draft EA/IS.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SECTION 2.0 – REFERENCES AND DATA SOURCE LIST

The following is a list of references used in the preparation of this document. References to Publications prepared by Federal or State agencies may be found with the agency responsible for providing such information.

Google Earth, 2010. Accessed November 2010.

For other References, refer to Section 9.0 of the Draft EA/IS.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SECTION 3.0 – REPORT AUTHORS AND CONSULTANTS

Refer to Section 8.0 of the Draft EA/IS.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK